



Serial No. 08/487,526
Docket No. 05634.0355

PATENT

38/H
8-25-02
NP

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicants : John C. Harvey and
James W. Cuddihy

Serial No. : 08/487,526

Filed : June 7, 1995

For : SIGNAL PROCESSING APPARATUS AND METHODS

Group Art Unit : 2614

Examiner : Harvey, D.

BOX: AF

Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

RECEIVED
FEB 12 2002
Technology Center 2600

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. AMENDMENT AND REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116.....	8
A. In the Claims.....	8
II. SUMMARY OF APPLICANTS' RESPONSE AND REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE OF PENDING CLAIMS.....	22
A. General Summary of Proposed Amended Claims and Specification Support thereto	22
B. Summary of and Specification Support for the Amended Claims	26
1. Independent Claim 2.....	26
a. Dependent Claim 3	28
b. Dependent Claim 4	28
c. Dependent Claim 5	29
d. Dependent Claim 6	29
e. Dependent Claim 7	30
f. Dependent Claim 8	30
g. Dependent Claim 9	31
h. Dependent Claim 10	31
i. Dependent Claim 11	31
j. Dependent Claim 12	32
k. Dependent Claim 13	32
l. Dependent Claim 14	32
m. Dependent Claim 15	33
n. Dependent Claim 16	33
o. Dependent Claim 17	33
p. Dependent Claim 18	33
2. Independent Claim 20.....	34
a. Dependent Claim 21	36
b. Dependent Claim 22	37

c. Dependent Claim 23	37
3. Independent Claim 24	38
a. Dependent Claim 25	40
4. Independent Claim 26	40
a. Dependent Claim 27	43
b. Dependent Claim 28	44
5. Independent Claim 29	44
a. Dependent Claim 30	46
6. Independent Claim 33	47
a. Dependent Claim 34	49
b. Dependent Claim 35	50
c. Dependent Claim 36	50
7. Independent Claim 37	51
a. Dependent Claim 38	52
b. Dependent Claim 39	53
c. Dependent Claim 40	53
d. Dependent Claim 41	54
e. Dependent Claim 42	55
8. Independent Claim 43	55
a. Dependent Claim 44	58
b. Dependent Claim 45	59
c. Dependent Claim 46	59
d. Dependent Claim 47	59
e. Dependent Claim 48	60
f. Dependent Claim 49	60
9. Independent Claim 51	61
a. Dependent Claim 52	62
b. Dependent Claim 53	63
c. Dependent Claim 54	63
d. Dependent Claim 55	63
e. Dependent Claim 56	64
10. Independent Claim 57	65
a. Dependent Claim 58	67
b. Dependent Claim 59	67
c. Dependent Claim 60	68
III. RESPONSE TO PRELIMINARY MATTERS	69
A. Introduction	69
B. Request to Withdraw Finality of Instant Office Action	69
C. Response to Administrative Requirement	70
D. Response to Miscellaneous Issues Raised in Final Office Action	70
IV. RESPONSE TO SUPPORT AND PRIORITY ISSUES	73
A. Response to Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112	73
1. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph	73
a. Written Description	73
(1) Summary of the Law	73
(2) The Examiner Has Not Met His Burden Of Proof For His Unsupported Rejection Of All Pending Claims Under § 112-1	77
(3) Responses to Miscellaneous § 112-1 Problems That Allegedly Support Examiner's Blanket Rejection of All Pending Claims	80
(a) The Examiner's Assertion that Claims Cannot be Immediately Discerned from the Disclosure	80
(b) The Examiner's Assertion of Improper Use of the 1981 Disclosure	81
(c) The Examiner's Assertion of Improper Use of Amended Claims	81
(d) The Examiner's Assertion that the Use of Different Words Makes Locating Support a Monumental Task	82

(e) The Examiner's Assertion that Support Must be Identified in a Single Embodiment/Example	83
(f) The Examiner's Assertion of Improper Reliance on Twisted/Inconsistent Definitions of Terminology	84
(4) Responses to the Specific § 112-1 Problems Identified by Examiner in the Examples	84
b. Responses to Examiner's Rejections Based on § 112 for Lack of Enablement (All Claims Directed to the Processing/Distribution of Digital Television).....	87
2. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph	88
a. Blanket Rejections for Which Examiner Has Not Met His Burden of Proof (All Pending Claims Are Rejected Under § 112-2 for Indefiniteness).....	88
b. Specific Arguments Regarding § 112-2.....	88
3. Conclusion	92
B. Applicants' Response with Respect to Claim of Priority Under 35 U.S.C. § 120.....	92
C. Response to Examiner's Denial of Priority to 1981	97
1. Applicants' Allegedly Improper Reliance on Written Description Support in the 1981 Application	98
2. The Alleged Effects of Applicants' Decision Not to Incorporate by Reference the 1981 Application into the 1987 Application as Originally Filed	98
3. Best Mode.....	99
4. Specific Issues	100
a. The Technology Disclosed in the 1981 and 1987 Disclosures Is Sufficiently Similar to Support All of the Currently Pending Claims	100
b. The 1981 Disclosure of "Instructions" and "Commands" Supports the Recitation of "Downloading of Computer Software/Programming"	102
c. Consistent Interpretations Are Applied to Claim Limitations to Find Support in the 1981 and 1987 Disclosures.....	103
d. Applicants Use One Consistent Definition of "Programming"	105
V. RESPONSE TO PRIOR ART REJECTIONS.....	107
A. Legal Requirements for Rejections Based on Prior Art.....	107
1. Legal Requirements for Anticipation.....	107
2. Legal Requirements for Obviousness Based Rejections.....	108
3. Legal Requirements for Allowability of dependent claims depending on an allowed independent claim	110
B. Rejections rendered moot by cancellation of certain claims.....	110
C. Response to Specific Prior Art Rejections.....	111
1. Rejections over Standard Television Receivers/Sets as Exemplified by Lunn.....	111
a. Summary of Lunn	111
b. Summary of the Application of Lunn	111
c. Deficiencies in the Application of Lunn	111
d. Independent Claim 2.....	112
(1) Dependent Claim 7	113
(2) Dependent Claim 8	113
(3) Dependent Claim 17	114
(4) Dependent Claim 18	114
e. Independent Claim 37.....	115
(1) Dependent Claim 41	115
f. Independent Claim 51.....	116
(1) Dependent Claim 55	117
2. Rejections based on any of Hutt, Bart, Oono, and Betts.....	117
a. Summary of Hutt	117
b. Summary of Bart.....	117
c. Summary of Oono.....	118
d. Summary of Betts	118
e. Summary of the Application of any of Hutt, Bart, Oono and Betts	119
f. Independent Claim 2.....	119
(1) Dependent Claim 7	120

(2) Dependent Claim 8	120
(3) Dependent Claim 17	121
(4) Dependent Claim 18	121
g. Independent Claim 20	121
(1) Dependent Claim 22	123
h. Independent Claim 37	123
(1) Dependent Claim 41	124
i. Independent Claim 51	125
(1) Dependent Claim 55	126
3. Rejections based on Oono, Betts, or Barrett	126
a. Summary of Barrett	126
b. Independent Claim 29	127
4. Rejections based on Hirashima, JP 0049084	128
a. Summary of Hirashima, JP 0049084	128
b. Summary of Application of Hirashima, JP 0049084	128
c. Deficiencies in the Application of Hirashima, JP 0049084	129
d. Independent Claim 2	129
(1) Dependent Claim 7	131
(2) Dependent Claim 8	132
(3) Dependent Claim 17	132
(4) Dependent Claim 18	133
e. Independent Claim 20	133
(1) Dependent Claim 22	135
f. Independent Claim 24	136
g. Independent Claim 26	137
(1) Dependent Claim 27	139
(2) Dependent Claim 28	139
5. Rejections based on Jackson et al., G.B. Pat. No. 1,213,357	140
a. Summary of Jackson et al., G.B. Pat. No. 1,213,357	140
b. Summary of FOA's Application Jackson et al., G.B. Pat. No. 1,213,357	141
c. Deficiencies in the FOA's Application of Application Jackson et al., G.B. Pat. No. 1,213,357	141
d. Independent Claim 2	142
(1) Dependent Claim 7	143
(2) Dependent Claim 8	143
(3) Dependent Claim 17	143
(4) Dependent Claim 18	143
e. Independent Claim 20	144
(1) Dependent Claim 22	145
f. Independent Claim 24	145
g. Independent Claim 26	145
(1) Dependent Claim 27	146
(2) Dependent Claim 28	146
h. Independent Claim 29	147
i. Independent Claim 37	148
(1) Dependent Claim 41	149
6. Rejections based on Block et al., U.S. Pat. No. 4,225,884	149
a. Summary of Block et al., U.S. Pat. No. 4,225,884	149
b. Summary of FOA's Application of Block et al., U.S. Pat. No. 4,225,884	150
c. Deficiencies of the FOA's Application of of Block et al., U.S. Pat. No. 4,225,884	150
d. Independent Claim 2	151
(1) Dependent Claim 7	152
(2) Dependent Claim 8	152
(3) Dependent Claim 17	152
(4) Dependent Claim 18	153
e. Independent Claim 20	153

(1) Dependent Claim 22	154
f. Independent Claim 24	154
g. Independent Claim 26	155
(1) Dependent Claim 27	156
(2) Dependent Claim 28	156
h. Independent Claim 29	156
i. Independent Claim 33	157
j. Independent Claim 37	158
(1) Dependent Claim 41	159
7. Rejections based on Moortgat-Pick in view of Schubin	159
a. Summary of Moortgat-Pick	159
b. Summary of Moortgat-Pick	159
c. Summary of the Application of Moortgat-Pick in view of Schubin	160
d. Deficiencies in the Application of Moortgat-Pick in view of Schubin	160
e. Independent Claim 2	161
(1) Dependent Claim 7	162
(2) Dependent Claim 8	163
(3) Dependent Claim 17	163
(4) Dependent Claim 18	163
8. Rejections based on CBS/CCETT North American Broadcast Teletext Specification and Appendix B, CBS Broadcast Teletext System Standard, "Petition for Rulemaking"	164
a. Summary of CBS/CCETT North American Broadcast Teletext Specification	164
b. Summary of Appendix B, CBS Broadcast Teletext System Standard, "Petition for Rulemaking"	165
c. Summary of Application of CBS/CCETT North American Broadcast Teletext Specification in view of Summary of Appendix B, CBS Broadcast Teletext System Standard, "Petition for Rulemaking"	165
d. Deficiencies in the Application of CBS/CCETT North American Broadcast Teletext Specification in view of Summary of Appendix B, CBS Broadcast Teletext System Standard, "Petition for Rulemaking"	166
e. Independent Claim 2	167
(1) Dependent Claim 7	168
(2) Dependent Claim 8	168
(3) Dependent Claim 17	169
(4) Dependent Claim 18	169
f. Independent Claim 24	170
g. Independent Claim 43	171
(1) Dependent Claim 46	172
9. Rejections based on Mainichi in view of Lunn	172
a. Summary of Mainichi	172
b. Summary of the Application of Mainichi in view of Lunn	173
c. Deficiencies in the Application of Mainichi in view of Lunn	173
d. Independent Claim 2	174
(1) Dependent Claim 7	175
(2) Dependent Claim 8	175
(3) Dependent Claim 17	176
(4) Dependent Claim 18	176
e. Independent Claim 20	176
(1) Dependent Claim 22	178
f. Independent Claim 24	179
g. Independent claim 26	180
(1) Dependent Claim 27	181
(2) Dependent Claim 28	181
h. Independent claim 37	181
(1) Dependent Claim 41	182

10.	Rejections based on Official Notice of Conventional TV/Teletext in view of Gunn et al., “A Public Broadcaster’s View of Teletext in the United States”	183
a.	Summary of Gunn et al., “A Public Broadcaster’s View of Teletext in the United States”....	183
b.	Summary of Application of Official Notice Conventional TV/Teletext in view of Gunn, et al., “A Public Broadcaster’s View of Teletext in the United States”	183
c.	Deficiencies in the Application of Official Notice of Conventional TV/Teletext in view of Gunn, et al., “A Public Broadcaster’s View of Teletext in the United States”	184
d.	Independent Claim 2	186
(1)	Dependent Claim 7	187
(2)	Dependent Claim 8	187
(3)	Dependent Claim 17	188
(4)	Dependent Claim 18	188
e.	Independent Claim 20	189
(1)	Dependent Claim 22	191
f.	Independent Claim 24	191
g.	Independent Claim 26	193
(1)	Dependent Claim 27	194
(2)	Dependent Claim 28	194
h.	Independent Claim 29	195
i.	Independent Claim 37	196
(1)	Dependent Claim 41	197
11.	Rejections based on Zaboklicki, DE 2,904,981	197
a.	Summary of Zaboklicki, DE 2,904,981	197
b.	Summary of FOA’s Application of Zaboklicki, DE 2,904,981	198
c.	Deficiencies in the FOA’s Application of Zaboklicki, DE 2,904,981	198
d.	Independent Claim 2	200
(1)	Dependent Claim 7	201
(2)	Dependent Claim 8	202
(3)	Dependent Claim 17	202
(4)	Dependent Claim 18	202
e.	Independent Claim 20	203
(1)	Dependent Claim 22	204
f.	Independent Claim 24	204
g.	Independent Claim 26	207
(1)	Dependent Claim 27	208
(2)	Dependent Claim 28	208
h.	Independent Claim 29	208
i.	Independent Claim 33	209
12.	Rejections based on Etkin, “Vertical Interval Signal Applications,” in view of Stern, “An Automated Programming Control System for Cable TV.”	210
a.	Summary of Etkin, “Vertical Interval Signal Applications”	210
b.	Summary of Stern, “An Automated Programming Control System for Cable TV”	211
c.	Summary of FOA’s Application of Etkin and Stern	211
d.	Deficiencies in the FOA’s Application of Etkin in view of Stern	211
e.	Independent claim 51	212
(1)	Dependent Claim 55	213
13.	Rejections Based on Sherry and Green	213
a.	Summary of Sherry	213
b.	Summary of Green	214
c.	Summary of the Application of Sherry and Green	214
d.	Independent Claim 57	215
14.	Rejection based on Honbashi in view of Stern	216
a.	Summary of Honbashi	216
b.	Summary of Stern	216
c.	Summary of the Application of Honbashi in view of Stern	216
d.	Deficiencies in the Application of Honbashi in view of Stern	217

e.	Independent Claim 57	217
15.	Rejections based on Baker	219
a.	Summary of Baker.	219
b.	Deficiencies in the Application of Baker	219
c.	Independent Claim 2	220
(1)	Dependent Claim 7	221
(2)	Dependent Claim 8	222
(3)	Dependent Claim 17	222
(4)	Dependent Claim 18	222
d.	Independent claim 20.....	223
(1)	Dependent Claim 22	224
e.	Independent claim 24.....	224
f.	Independent claim 26.....	225
(1)	Dependent Claim 27	226
(2)	Dependent Claim 28	226
g.	Independent Claim 29	227
h.	Independent Claim 37	228
(1)	Dependent Claim 41	228
i.	Independent claim 43.....	229
(1)	Dependent Claim 46	229
j.	Independent claim 51.....	230
(1)	Dependent Claim 55	231
k.	Independent claim 57.....	231
VI.	CONCLUSION	232
	APPENDIX A: Applicants' Marked-Up Claim Language	
	APPENDIX B: Certified Translation of Zaboklicki	
	APPENDIX C: Claim Support to the 1987 Specification and the 1981 Priority Document	
	APPENDIX D: Applicants' Previous Response to the PTO's Administrative Requirement	
	Filed December 29, 1998	